



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,712	12/12/2001	Vesa Rantanen	460-010741-US(PAR)	5232
2512	7590	10/24/2005	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			BAYERL, RAYMOND J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/017,712	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RANTANEN, VESA	
	<b>Examiner</b> Raymond J. Bayerl	<b>Art Unit</b> 2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2173

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 2 – 3, 6, 9, 11, 14 – 19, 22 – 25, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 2, “said area” does not find clear antecedent basis in parent claim 1’s “application area” and “selection area”. Also in claim 2, “the display” is unclear, in view of claim 1’s having both “a display of the first terminal” and a “display of the second terminal”. Claims 22, 23 have similar problems, with “the at least one area” and “the display”. Note still further claim 9, with “said area” and “the display”, when taken relative to parent claim 8.

As per claim 6, “the area defined on the display of the first terminal” (lines 2 – 3) does not find clear antecedent basis in the parent claim language—claim 1 has “an application area” and “at least one user defined selection area”. See also the similar problem in claim 11.

Independent claim 14 recites “said **limited** user defined selection area” at lines 9 – 10, with only “at least one user defined selection area” previously being recited.

As per claim 15, besides having “said area” without referring specifically to one of the two possible antecedents of “selection area” and “application areas” in parent claim 14, “said limiting frame” finds no clear antecedent in claim 14’s “user defined selection area”.

Art Unit: 2173

3. Claims 1 – 12, 14 – 18, 20, 22 – 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boss et al (“Boss”; US #5,758,110) in view of Palmer et al. (“Palmer”; US #6,151,020).

Concerning independent claim 1, and also comparable independent claims 8, 14, 20, Boss discloses “transmitting information from a first terminal to a second terminal”, where “visual information produced by one or more applications is displayed on a display of the first terminal”, with the establishment of both “an application area...for at least one of said one or more applications” and a “user defined selection area on the display of the first terminal”, and which also involves “transmitting the information contained in said user defined selection area to the second terminal”, with “visual information received in the second terminal” “displayed on said display of the second terminal”:

The invention provides methods and apparatus for task based application sharing in a graphic user interface such as Windows. A user, referred to as the host user, designates an application to be **shared**, referred to as a shared application. **Another user at a remote location**, referred to as the client user, shares control of the shared application. The shared application runs on and executes only on the host system. The client system has a **rectangular area on the display screen within which all shared applications are displayed**. Further, the client user can **see the windows of a shared application** and controls the shared application by performing mouse and keyboard movements with the client keyboard and mouse. Because the shared application is running on the host system, all client mouse and keyboard movements are first transmitted to the host system and actually executed on the host system. (col. 2 lines 32-47).

Therefore, in Boss, a “first” host and “second” client “terminal” each have a rectangular “application area”, such as the one for App1 in fig 7. In the Host PC display, a user designates such a region to be shared, as in the “selection area”. As a result, “visual information from one or more applications” is being jointly displayed on both terminals at the same time.

The amended claim now stipulates that the “user defined selection area” is defined “independently of said application area”, and in “the second terminal”, that the “display” arising from such a “selection area” “is not visually restricted”. The Examiner will concede that Boss contains no **explicit** teaching of a “selection area” apart from the “application area”, since the shared region in Boss is both the one used for the “application” **and** for “selection”, nor of a “second terminal” display that “is not visually restricted”, since there is restriction placed upon the client window in Boss that is based upon the extent of the shared application.

However, Palmer discloses REAL TIME BIT MAP CAPTURE AND SHARING FOR COLLABORATIVE TOOLS in which the disclosed system shares a display region among a plurality of users by selecting a first bit map from a series of bit maps used to display the shared display region on a server system (Abstract). As is illustrated in fig 1 and described at col 3, line 53 – col 4, line 24, The shared region 18 can be modified in size or location using mouse or keyboard commands issued by a user of the server system 10, and Any application windows which are displayed either partly or completely within the shared region 18 are shared between the server 10 and the client systems.

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use the independent "selection area" that may contain "an application area" as is seen in Palmer, in the two-"terminal" arrangement of Boss, where a region is shared for an application, with the result as per Palmer that the "selection area" display "is not visually restricted" to the "application area", because this will allow a greater amount of user-relevant content to be shared from the host to the client in the Boss setting. Please note at least the motivation seen in Boss for this adaptation in fig 7, where the rectangular area for App1 is extended, when the application's Help1 is provided, this including multiple windows within a single selection to be shared (see also Boss, col 7, lines 41 – 53).

Regarding claim 2, the content of shared region 18 in Palmer is controlled to exist within "a limiting frame". As in claims 3, 9, 15, 16, 17, Palmer teaches that "the location, size and/or the shape of said limiting frame can be changed" when the border of the shared region is modified by a user. As has been noted above, such a region of the "limiting frame" in Palmer can be "other than a frame of the application area" (claim 24), and it can be resized and repositioned "to encompass any region of the display" (claim 25) the server user desires.

As per claim 4, Boss discloses that "the visual information received in the second terminal is displayed on a fixed location of said display of the second terminal": it is possible that windows will remain in a single position. Concerning claims 5, 10, Boss also teaches that the "presentation location of the visual information received in the second terminal can be changed in the display of the second terminal", since in Boss,

Art Unit: 2173

the client user can see the windows of a shared application and controls the shared application by performing mouse and keyboard movements with the client keyboard and mouse. (col. 2 lines 41-47). The client user in Boss has control over the windows appearing in the display remote from the host, and can thus reposition to suit the needs of the client's desktop.

Regarding claims 6, 11 Boss discloses that "information related to the location of the area defined on the display of the first terminal is transmitted to the second terminal, wherein the visual information transmitted from the defined area is displayed on a substantially corresponding location on said display of the second terminal":

FIG. 8 illustrates the detection of covered portions feature of the present invention. On host system 14, a shared task application 1 (app 1) is partially covered by a non-shared task application 3 (app 3). The lower right corner of application 1 covered by non-shared task application 3 may contain data. ... When application 1 or application 3 is moved, or application 1 is brought to the top of the display screen of host system 14, the hatching on client system 11 is removed and the previously hatched data is updated. (col. 7 line 54 – col. 8 line 3).

The changes occurring at the host site in Boss are transmitted so as to affect the display region presented for the shared information on the client.

As per claims 7, 12, 18, Boss suggests that "the information display of the first terminal is transmitted at intervals, wherein the visual information is updated at intervals on the display of the second terminal", since periodic packet transmissions must be made from host to client in order to maintain a properly updated version of the shared screen.

As in claim 22 (and also claim 23), where “the at least one area is a portion of the application area of the display randomly selected by the user”, the user at the Palmer server side can perform random repositionings.

As per claim 26 (and also claims 27 - 29), the Palmer “user defined selection area contains visual information from a plurality of applications”, when it is so sized and positioned as per the user to incorporate them. Boss also has the fig 7 example of plural windows appearing on a “second terminal” for the application.

4. Claims 13, 19, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boss in view of Palmer and Hawkins et al (“Hawkins”; US #6,343,318).

Boss in view of Palmer shows a method and apparatus for sharing applications via a graphical user interface over a communication network. The apparatus displays a user-modifiable rectangular area on the host machine (Palmer) and allows any client machine to view operations only in the rectangular area (Boss). But while the identical disclosures of Boss and Palmer are of two terminals being connected over a communication network, which allows packets to be sent between the host and client, Boss does not show the host or client having a “wireless communication device”.

However, Hawkins shows a host machine communicating to a client machine over a wireless network. The wireless client receives information from the host machine and displays information to screen.

Specifically as per claims 13, 19, 21, Hawkins discloses that at least one terminal is a wireless communication device:

Art Unit: 2173

FIG. 4 shows a wireless network topology 400 used for some embodiments of the invention. The main components of the wireless communications system are the wireless client 405, the wireless network access point 410, the tunneler 430, the proxy server 180, and the Internet 190. The wireless network access point 410 has a corresponding wireless network access point radio 420.

It would also have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a host terminal communicating to a wireless client as per Hawkins to allow a Boss terminal to display information, from a user-specified rectangular area as per Palmer on a host machine, for ultimate display on "second terminal". Motivation rests in the desirability for plural users to join collaborative efforts, as is the case in both Boss and Palmer, something that is directly aided by migration to a wireless platform.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 29, filed 19 September 2005, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


The additional US Patent documents made of record (see attached form PTO-892) relate to the communication of content from one display to another.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond J. Bayerl whose telephone number is (571) 272-4045. The examiner can normally be reached on M - Th from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM ET.

Art Unit: 2173

8. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (571) 272-4048. All patent application related correspondence transmitted by FAX **must be directed** to the central FAX number (571) 273-8300.

9. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.



RAYMOND J. BAYERL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2173

18 October 2005